

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 45 remain in this application. Claims 46 through 54 have been cancelled. No claims are withdrawn. Claims 55 through 61 have been added.

Initially, it is noted that while claim 43 has been aggregated with the other rejected claims in the listing in the Office Action Summary, the Detailed Action does not contain any specific basis for rejection of claim 43. Clarification is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action

The abstract has been objected to for the informalities noted in the Office Action.

The abstract has been amended in a manner believed to clarify any informalities in the language, particularly at the points identified in the Office Action.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action

The specification has been objected to for the informalities noted in the Office Action.

The specification has been updated to reflect the serial numbers and status of the incorporated patent applications and patents.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action

Claim 24 has been objected to for the informalities noted in the Office Action.

Claim 24 has been amended in a manner believed to clarify any informalities in the language.

Withdrawal of the objection to claim 24 is therefore respectfully requested.

Paragraphs 6 through 60 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 12, 19 through 22, 24, and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Wittgreffe et al.

Claims 13 through 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wittgreffe in view of Java Network Programming.

Claims 25 and 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wittgreffe in view of The Hypertext Transfer Protocol version 1.1.

Claims 23 and 27 through 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wittgreffe.

Claim 34 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wittgreffe in view of Harold.

Claims 44 and 45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wittgreffe in view of Pant.

Claims 35 through 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wittgreffe in view of Harold, and further in view of the HTTP/1.1 protocol.

Claims 39 and 40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wittgreffe in view of Harold, and further in view of Rosenzweig.

Claims 41 and 42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wittgreffe in view of Harold, and further in view of Rosenzweig and the HTTP/1.1 protocol.

Claim 44 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wittgreffe in view of Harold, and further in view of Rosenzweig, the HTTP/1.1 protocol, and Pant.

Claims 1 and 11, particularly as amended, each require:

a program of instructions configured to be executed by said executory module and said capture module to:

- obtain a query from a user by said capture module;
- compare said query, by said capture module, to databases from a database search listing of a plurality of candidate databases;
- select, by said capture module, databases relevant to said query obtained by the user;
- route said query, by said executory module, to said selected databases so that said selected databases use said query to locate documents relevant to said query;
- obtain results, by said executory module, from said selected databases by:
 - capturing links to relevant documents from a results page obtained from said selected databases, said links providing a path to said relevant documents;
 - following said links to said relevant documents;
 - capturing said relevant documents; and
 - process said results.

It is submitted that the Wittgreffe patent, which is relied upon in all of the rejections of the claims of the application, does not disclose or suggest, for example, "comparing] said query, by said capture module, to databases from a database search listing of a plurality of candidate databases", "select[ing], by said capture module, databases relevant to said

query obtained by the user” and “rout[ing] said query, by said executory module, to said selected databases so that said selected databases use said query to locate documents relevant to said query”. It is therefore submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art, considering the Wittgreffe patent (even in light of the other cited documents), would not be led to the claimed invention.

Further, claim 6 requires that “said database search listing further comprises at least one information field containing query format information for formatting queries submitted to each one of said plurality of pre-selected databases”, and claim 7 requires that “said database search listing further comprises at least one information field conveying query format information for formatting of a query associated with at least one of said plurality of pre-selected databases”. Claim 11 also requires “said database search listing further comprising at least one field conveying query format information for formatting of a query associated with at least one of said plurality of pre-selected databases”. The rejection of claims 6 and 7 refer to the Wittgreffe patent at Fig. 1, item 120 and col. 6, lines 60 through 64, which states (emphasis added):

For example, if appropriate, the query file 120 may record a particular character string known to be included in a page of returned query results as an indication by the site that the page is the last page of *results*, or that at least one further page is yet to be transmitted by the site.

It is submitted that the “query file 120” that includes matter regarding the *results* provided by a site is not “*query format* information for formatting a query”, as required by claims 6 and 7. In fact, it is submitted that the referenced discussion in the Wittgreffe patent is more likely to lead one of ordinary skill in the art to believe that the query file of Wittgreffe contains information about the results of a query, rather than the query itself. Therefore, it is submitted that the Wittgreffe patent does not anticipate the requirements of claims 6, 7 and 11.

Appln. No. 09/911,434
Amendment dated March 28, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed October 28, 2005

Withdrawal of the §102(e) and §103(a) rejections of claims 1 through 45 is therefore respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Date: MARCH 27, 2006

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
Customer No. **40,158**
P.O. Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357